APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/921,659	08/06/2001	Amy L. Sherwood	BS01-001	8201

38823   7590   11/22/2004

THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP/
BELLSOUTH I.P. CORP
100 GALLERIA PARKWAY
SUITE 1750
ATLANTA, GA 30339

EXAMINER
CLARK, ISAAC R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 11/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		09/921,659	SHERWOOD, AMY L.
		Examiner	**Art Unit**
		Isaac R Clark	2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 August 2001</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>06 August 2001</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/02/2001</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-34 are presented for examination.

Priority

2.   No claim for priority has been made in this application.

3.   The effective filing date for the subject matter in the pending claims in this

application is 08/06/2001.

Drawings

4.   The Examiner contends that the drawings submitted on 08/06/2001 are

acceptable for examination proceedings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6.   Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as

being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject

matter which applicant regards as the invention.

7.   As per claim 20, claim 20 recites both an apparatus ("The system of claim

15") and a process step ("saving a configuration of delivery option settings that is

associated with a first set of addresses"). A claim reciting both an apparatus and

the method steps of using the apparatus is indefinite. See In Ex parte Lyell, 17

USPQ2d 1548 (BPAI 1990).

8.   Claim 21 is rejected based on its dependency on claim 20.

9.   For the purpose of examining claims 20 and 21, claim 20 will be construed

as if written "20. The system of claim 15, further comprising means for saving a

configuration of delivery option settings that is associated with a first set of

addresses."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11.   Claims 1, 2, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Johnson et al. (US Patent 5,694,616) hereinafter Johnston.

12.   As per claim 1, Johnson discloses a method for selectively applying a

delivery option (Fig. 2; col. 2, lines 5-10; "RP attribute") to an email comprising

the steps of:

        (a) listing email addresses (Fig.2, step 220);

        (b) selecting a plurality of said email addresses in the course of

composing an email message (Fig. 2, step 225);

        (c) selectively applying the delivery option to one or more, but not all, of

said plurality of email addresses (Fig. 2, step 235, col. 4, lines 4-6); and

        (d) sending the email to said plurality of email addresses (Fig. 2, step

240).

13.   As per claim 2, Johnson discloses the method of claim 1, further

comprising listing email addresses on a computer screen (col. 3, lines 63-67; Fig.

1, item 30a).

14.   As per claims 15 and 16, claims 15 and 16 are apparatus claims which

carry out the means described in claims 1 and 2. Johnson describes a computer

network system for carrying out the method of claims 1 and 2 (Fig. 1). Claims 15

and 16 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 2.

15.   Claims 9, 13, 14, 23, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being anticipated by Gupta (US Published Application 2002/0194341).

16.   As per claim 23, Gupta discloses a system for selectively applying a

delivery option to addressees in an email, comprising: (a) means for displaying

an address book (Fig. 5); (b) means for choosing addressees from the address

book (Fig. 5, Paragraph 0042); (c) means for setting a flag indicating that more

than one addressee has been chosen (Fig. 10, block 1030); (d) means for

displaying an email delivery options selection window if said flag is set (Fig. 5,

window for selection options; Paragraph 0049, opportunity to review each version

may be presented if multiple addressees are given); (e) means for selectively

applying delivery options to each of the addressees (Paragraph 0049; each

recipient receives a copy of the message formatted to his/her specific settings);

and (f) means for sending the email (Paragraph 0069).

17.   As per claim 9, claim 9 describes the method carried out by the apparatus

of claim 23. Claim 9 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 23.

18.   As per claim 27, Gupta discloses the system of claim 23, further

comprising means for saving a configuration of delivery option settings that is

·associated with a first set of addressees (Paragraph 0066; configurations or

options associated with a stored list of addresses are retrieved implying that they

were previously saved).

19.   As per claim 28 Gupta discloses the system of claim 27, further

comprising means for matching a second set of addressees with the first set of

addresses and automatically setting delivery options saved with respect to the

first set of addressees (Paragraphs 0067-0068).

20.   As per claims 13 and 14, claims 13 and 14 claim the method carried out

by the apparatus described in claims 27 and 28 respectively. Claims 13 and 14

are rejected for the same reasons as claims 28 and 27.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

21.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described
> as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to
> be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which
> said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

22.   Claims 3 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Johnson et al. (US Patent 5,694,616) hereinafter Johnston in

view of Shaw et al. (US Patent 6,247,045) hereinafter Shaw.

23.   As per claim 17, Johnson fails to explicitly teach the system of claim 15,

further comprising means for sending a separate email for a group of addresses

that have the same delivery option configuration.

24.   Shaw teaches sending a separate email for groups of addresses that are

receiving identical messages (col. 7, lines 1-30).

25.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time

the invention was made to combine the teaching of Johnson and Shaw to send a

separate email for each group of addressed receiving the same delivery option

configuration because they both deal with sending emails to groups of recipients.

Furthermore, the teaching of Shaw to generate a single email message for all

addresses receiving the same content would allow conserve bandwidth and

server resources on the sender's system while still allowing sending messages

with a variety of delivery options.

26.   As per claim 3, claim 3 describes the method carried out by the apparatus

of claim 17. Claim 3 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 17.

27.   Claims 4 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Johnson et al. (US Patent 5,694,616) hereinafter Johnston in

view of Collins et al. (US Published Application 2002/0013817) hereinafter

Collins.

28.   As per claim 18, Johnson fails to teach the system of claim 15, further

comprising means for sending a separate email to each address of said plurality

of addresses.

29. Collins teaches a system for sending emails to a group of recipients wherein a separate copy of the email is generated and sent to each designated recipient (Paragraph 0012).

30. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Johnson and Collins to send separate emails with selected delivery options set to for each email addressee because they both deal with sending emails to multiple addressees. Furthermore, the teaching of Collins would allow provide enhanced privacy for the recipients by not transmitting their addresses to the other recipients of the email (Collins paragraph 0013).

31. As per claim 4, claim 4 describes the method carried out by the apparatus of claim 18. Claim 4 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 18.

32. Claims 5, 19, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (US Patent 5,694,616) hereinafter Johnston in view of Thorne et al. (US Patent 5,958,005) hereinafter Thorne.

33. As per claim 19, Johnson teaches the system of claim 15 including selectively applying a delivery option to one or more but not all of a plurality of email addresses (Fig. 2, step 235, col. 4, lines 4-6).

34. Johnson fails to teach selectively applying more than one delivery option to less than all of the plurality of email addresses.

35. Thorne teaches selectively applying more than one delivery option to an email address (Abstract; Fig. 3, blocks 304-325; col. 7, lines 6-15).

36.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time

the invention was made to combine the teaching of Johnson and Thorne to

selectively apply more than one delivery option to one or more of a plurality of

email addresses because they both deal with applying delivery options to email

addresses. Furthermore, the teaching of Thorne to apply more than one delivery

option allows the user to have more control over the handling and delivery of

email messages sent to recipients (Thorne, col. 2, lines 47-56).

37.   As per claim 5, claim 5 describes the method carried out by the apparatus

of claim 19. Claim 5 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 19.

38.   As per claim 29, Johnson teaches an email system for selectively applying

delivery options to an email having a plurality of addressees, comprising: an

email client (Fig. 1, item 30) operable to display an address list (Fig. 2, steps

220) and to select addressees for an email (col. 3, lines 49-51); wherein at least

one of the email client and the email server is operable to selectively apply a

delivery option to one or more, but not all, of the addressees (Fig. 2, steps 215-

225; col. 3, line 64-col. 4, line 8).

39.   Johnson fails to explicitly teach an email server in communication with the

email client and connected to a network.

40.   Thorne teaches a system for applying delivery options to email

communications (Abstract; col. 2, lines 45-56) including an email server 112 in

communication with an email client 118 and connected to a network 110 (Fig. 1,

col. 4, lines 38-56).

41.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time

the invention was made to combine the teaching of Johnson and Thorne to

provide an email server in the system taught by Johnson because they both deal

with applying delivery options to email addresses. Furthermore, the teaching of

Thorne to provide an email server in communication with an email client over a

network would provide a centralized storage for client mail boxes in an

organization unit allowing setting of email policies and protocols on a group basis

(Thorne, col. 4, lines 49-61).

42.   Claims 6, 7, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Johnson et al. (US Patent 5,694,616) hereinafter Johnston in

view of Gupta (US Published Application 2002/0194341).

43.   As per claim 20 as construed, Johnson fails to teach the system of claim

15, further comprising means for saving a configuration of delivery option settings

that is associated with a first set of addresses.

44.   Gupta teaches saving delivery options associated with groups of email

addresses (Paragraph 0066; configurations or options are retrieved implying that

they were previously saved).

45.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time

the invention was made to combine the teaching of Johnson and Gupta to save

the configuration of delivery options associated with a first set of addresses

because they both deal with sending email messages to groups of addressees.

Furthermore, the teaching of Gupta to save the delivery options would make

them available for retrieval to assign to future emails to the same addressees

(Gupta, Paragraph 0067).

46.   As per claim 21, Johnson fails to explicitly teach the system of claim 20,

further comprising means for matching a second set of addresses with the first

set of addresses and automatically setting delivery options saved with respect to

the first set of addresses.

47.   Gupta teaches matching a second set of addresses with the saved options

and automatically setting delivery options based on the saved options (Gupta,

Paragraphs 0067-0068).

48.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time

the invention was made to combine the teaching of Johnson and Gupta to save

the configuration of delivery options associated with a first set of addresses and

to use the saved configuration to set delivery options on a second set of

addresses because they both deal with sending email messages to groups of

addressees. Furthermore, the teaching of Gupta to set delivery options based on

a saved configuration would allow automatically configuring options for a set of

email addresses thus saving time and labor for users (Gupta, Paragraph 0069).

49.   As per claims 6 and 7, claims 6 and 7 claim the method carried out by the

apparatus described in claims 20 and 21 respectively. Claims 6 and 7 are

rejected for the same reasons as claims 20 and 21.

50.   Claims 8 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Johnson et al. (US Patent 5,694,616) hereinafter Johnston in

view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

51.   As per claim 22, Johnson fails to teach the system of claim 15, wherein

the delivery option is selected from delivery confirmation and return receipt.

52.   The AAPA teaches that systems where in which the user selectively

applies delivery confirmation and return receipt options to an email were well

known in the art at the time the Applicant made the invention (Background, page

2, Paragraphs 0004-0006).

53.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time

the invention was made to combine the teaching of Johnson and AAPA to

selectively apply delivery confirmation and return receipt options to one or more

of a plurality of email addresses because they each deal with applying delivery

options to emails. Furthermore, the teaching of AAPA to apply delivery

confirmation and return receipts to emails allow the system to receive email

confirmations, allowing the sender to verify that his emails have been received.

54.   As per claim 8, claim 8 describes the method carried out by the apparatus

of claim 22. Claim 8 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 22.

55.   Claims 10 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Gupta as applied to claims 9 and 23 above in view of

Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

56.   As per claim 24, Johnson fails to teach the system of claim 23, wherein

the email delivery options selection window permits selective application of at

least one of delivery confirmation and return receipt.

57.   The AAPA teaches that systems where in which the user selectively

applies delivery confirmation and return receipt options to an email were well

known in the art at the time the Applicant made the invention (Background, page 2, Paragraphs 0004-0006).

58.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Gupta and AAPA to provide the option to select delivery confirmation or return receipt options from the delivery options selection window because they each deal with applying delivery options to emails. Furthermore, the teaching of AAPA to apply delivery confirmation and return receipts to emails allow the system to receive email confirmations only from those addressees necessary allow the user to receive confirmation that his emails had been received by selected addressees.

59.   As per claim 10, claim 10 describes the method carried out by the apparatus of claim 24. Claim 10 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 24.

60.   Claims 11 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta as applied to claims 9 and 23 above in view of Shaw et al. (US Patent 6,247,045) hereinafter Shaw.

61.   As per claim 25, Gupta fails to explicitly teach the system of claim 23, further comprising means for sending a separate email for a group of addresses that have the same delivery option configuration.

62.   Shaw teaches sending a separate email for groups of addresses that are receiving identical messages (col. 7, lines 1-30).

63.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Gupta and Shaw to send a separate email for each group of addressed receiving the same delivery option

configuration because they both deal with sending emails to groups of recipients.

Furthermore, the teaching of Shaw to generate a single email message for all

addresses receiving the same content would allow conserve bandwidth and

server resources on the sender's system while still allowing sending messages

with a variety of delivery options.

64.   As per claim 11, claim 11 describes the method carried out by the

apparatus of claim 25. Claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 25.

65.   Claims 12 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Gupta as applied to claims 9 and 23 above in view of Collins

et al. (US Published Application 2002/0013817) hereinafter Collins.

66.   As per claim 26, Gupta fails to teach the system of claim 23, further

comprising means for sending a separate email to each address of said plurality

of addresses.

67.   Collins teaches a system for sending emails to a group of recipients

wherein a separate copy of the email is generated and sent to each designated

recipient (Paragraph 0012).

68.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time

the invention was made to combine the teaching of Gupta and Collins to send

separate emails with selected delivery options set to for each email addressee

because they both deal with sending emails to multiple addressees.

Furthermore, the teaching of Collins would allow provide enhanced privacy for

the recipients by not transmitting their addresses to the other recipients of the

email (Collins paragraph 0013).

69.   As per claim 12, claim 12 describes the method carried out by the

apparatus of claim 26. Claim 12 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 26.

70.   Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Johnson and Thorne as applied to claims 29 and 23 above in view of Shaw et al.

(US Patent 6,247,045) hereinafter Shaw.

71.   As per claim 30, Johnson fails to explicitly teach the email system of claim

29, wherein one of the email client and email server sends a separate email for a

group of addressees that have the same delivery option configuration.

72.   Shaw teaches a system using an email client 104 to send a separate

email for groups of addresses that are receiving identical messages (Fig. 1, col.

7, lines 1-30).

73.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time

the invention was made to combine the teaching of Johnson and Shaw to send a

separate email for each group of addressed receiving the same delivery option

configuration because they both deal with sending emails to groups of recipients.

Furthermore, the teaching of Shaw to generate a single email message for all

addresses receiving the same content would allow conserve bandwidth and

server resources on the sender's system while still allowing sending messages

with a variety of delivery options.

74.   Claim 31 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Johnson and Thorne as applied to claim 29 in view of Collins et al. (US Published

Application 2002/0013817) hereinafter Collins.

75.   As per claim 31, Johnson fails to teach the email system of claim 29,

wherein one of the email client and email server generates and sends a separate

email to each addressee.

76.   Collins teaches a system for sending emails to a group of recipients

wherein a separate copy of the email is generated and sent to each designated

recipient (Paragraph 0012).

77.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time

the invention was made to combine the teaching of Johnson and Collins to send

separate emails with selected delivery options set to for each email addressee

because they both deal with sending emails to multiple addressees.

Furthermore, the teaching of Collins would allow provide enhanced privacy for

the recipients by not transmitting their addresses to the other recipients of the

email (Collins paragraph 0013).

78.   Claims 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Johnson and Thorne as applied to claim 29 in view of Gupta

(US Published Application 2002/0194341).

33. The email system of claim 32, wherein one of the email client and email

server matches a second set of addressees with the first set of addressees and

automatically sets delivery options saved with respect to the first set of

addressees.

79.   As per claim 32 as construed, Johnson fails to teach the email system of

claim 29, wherein one of the email client and email server saves a configuration

of delivery option settings that is associated with a first set of addressees.

80.   Gupta teaches saving delivery options associated with groups of email

addresses (Paragraph 0066; configurations or options are retrieved implying that

they were previously saved).

81.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time

the invention was made to combine the teaching of Johnson and Gupta to save

the configuration of delivery options associated with a first set of addresses

because they both deal with sending email messages to groups of addressees.

Furthermore, the teaching of Gupta to save the delivery options would make

them available for retrieval to assign to future emails to the same addressees

(Gupta, Paragraph 0067).

82.   As per claim 33, Johnson fails to explicitly teach the email system of claim

32, wherein one of the email client and email server matches a second set of

addressees with the first set of addressees and automatically sets delivery

options saved with respect to the first set of addressees.

83.   Gupta teaches matching a second set of addresses with the saved options

and automatically setting delivery options based on the saved options (Gupta,

Paragraphs 0067-0068).

84.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time

the invention was made to combine the teaching of Johnson and Gupta to save

the configuration of delivery options associated with a first set of addresses and

to use the saved configuration to set delivery options on a second set of

addresses because they both deal with sending email messages to groups of

addressees. Furthermore, the teaching of Gupta to set delivery options based on

a saved configuration would allow automatically configuring options for a set of email addresses thus saving time and labor for users (Gupta, Paragraph 0069).

85.   Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson and Thorne as applied to claim 29 in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

86.   As per claim 34, Johnson fails to teach the email system of claim 34, wherein the delivery options comprise delivery confirmation and return receipt.

87.   The AAPA teaches that systems where in which the user selectively applies delivery confirmation and return receipt options to an email were well known in the art at the time the Applicant made the invention (Background, page 2, Paragraphs 0004-0006).

88.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Johnson and AAPA to selectively apply delivery confirmation and return receipt options to one or more of a plurality of email addresses because they each deal with applying delivery options to emails. Furthermore, the teaching of AAPA to apply delivery confirmation and return receipts to emails allow the system to receive email confirmations, allowing the sender to verify that his emails have been received.

Conclusion

89.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents and publications are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to "System and method for selective application of email delivery options".

     i.   Raghunandan   6,775,689   Sending customized content in email to selected recipients.

     ii.   Costales et al.   6,044,395   Selected portions of email delivered separately from.

     iii.   Nielsen, Jakob   6,108,688   Delivery confirmations for email.

     iv.   Henderson et al.   6,185,603   Email incorporating codes which implement various delivery options

     v.   Lee et al.   6,212,553   Sending flags and attributes via email

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isaac R Clark whose telephone number is (571)272-3961. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free).

Irc

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100